

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10 and 12-39, as amended, remain herein.

Applicants note and appreciate the indication in the Office Action that claims 34-39 are allowed, and that claims 7 and 29 would be allowed if amended to include all the limitations of base claims upon which they were then dependent. Accordingly, claim 7 has been amended to include the limitations of former claim 1, and claim 29 has been amended to include the limitations of former claim 21, placing both claims 7 and 29 in independent form and in condition for immediate allowance. Claims 1 and 21, as well as claims 7 and 29 have been amended to clarify that the center section has a floor, and also has a cavity therein for receiving the rear-insert. Claims 1 and 21 have also been amended to recite that the rear-insert is a substantially transparent rear insert, and former claim 11 has been cancelled. Both the floor and transparent insert limitations have already been searched and examined in this application. This addition to claims 1 and 21, and thus to all claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-20, 21-28 and 30-33, is believed to put all claims in this application in condition for allowance.

The foregoing amendments are believed to place this application fully in condition for allowance and surely in better condition for any appeal. Accordingly entry of this Amendment and allowance of all claims are respectfully solicited.

1. Claim 1 was objected to because in line 7 the phrase "a cavity having a cavity" appeared to be redundant and not understood. It is apparent that the quoted language from claim 7 was previously intended to state "having a cavity floor for receiving the rear insert." The word "floor" was inadvertently omitted from that language. The "floor" limitation has been added to claim 1 as amended herein, and the claim language has been clarified, as explained above, to make it clear that it is the center section which has the floor, the cavity being a void in the center section above the floor. That same clarification has been made in all independent claims 1, 7, 21 and 29.

2. With respect to the rejections of claims herein over prior art references, applicants again note that the Office Action stated that claims 7 and 29, in their form at the time of the action, would be allowable if rewritten in independent form

including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 7 and 29 both included the limitations that the rear-insert is substantially transparent and positioned adjacent to the floor of the golf club head. In applicants' view, those limitations alone patentably distinguish over any and all prior art cited against the present application. However, claims 7 and 29 also included the limitation that the floor including a sight line visible through the rear-insert. While claims 7 and 29 have been placed in independent form, and thus are allowable as stated in the Office Action, applicants have also amended claims 1 and 21, and thus all claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-20, 21-28 and 30-33, so that those claims include both the transparent rear-insert and the floor, which limitations are believed to place all claims in this application in condition for allowance, which is respectfully solicited.

Serial No.: 10/016,179

Should the Examiner have any questions or suggestions concerning how this application might be placed in even better form for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP

June 2, 2005

Date

RWP/ame

Attorney Docket No.: 28952.5564

STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-1795
Tel: (202) 429-3000



Roger W. Parkhurst

Registration No. 25,177